Curriculum Evaluation and Management Subcommittee (CEMS) Meeting Minutes
Monday, September 10, 2018 @ 2:00 pm
E493 Conference Room & via WebEx

In attendance: Kurt Borg, Pat Carr, Marcia Francis, Dawn Hackman, Clint Hosford, Rebecca Maher, Annie Nickum, Adrienne Salentiny, John Shabb, Kelly Thormodson, Rick Van Eck and Susan Zelewski.
Not in attendance: Jon Allen, Mark Koponen, Devendra Pant,
Minutes submitted by: Alissa Hancock
Reviewed by: Adrienne Salentiny
Approved by: Kurt Borg / Rick Van Eck

AGENDA ITEM	SUMMARY	ACTION/FOLLOW-UP
1. Welcome	Meeting called to order at 2:04 p.m.	Informational
3. Old Business	**a.) Minutes from August 20, 2018**	MSC to approve August 20, 2018 minutes as amended Kurt Borg/Marcia Francis // all in favor; carried unanimously.
4. New Business	**a.) Recommendations for Objectives and Keywords will go to MCC in Sept. (Salentiny)** This is still being worked on and will be dispersed to CEMS for approval before it is forwarded to MCC. It is the hope that it will be ready by MCC's October meeting. CEMS was directed to report back to MCC, however the group decided that these some of these reports can be informative, rather than requiring a vote – in the interest of time and the always approaching LCME visit. There won't be much time difference in the case that MCC does disagree with our decisions. The committee will proceed with next steps in the meantime.	Informational
	b.) What will reporting look like? What questions do we want answered? (Van Eck/Salentiny) Some of the questions we need to address are 'What will these reports look like? How many do we think we might be able to do in a year? And what questions will we answer with these report?' To start, we need to make a list of mandated reports. In addition, though, Rick Van Eck suggested that more information on what we will need (and want) will be helpful going forward. Rick	

	suggests creating a working document with 10 or so major questions. These could be very simple, such as "a report on mapping, a report on assessment," etc. We will be able to figure out what can be done on our critical list as well as watch for things that are relevant to our future/wants list. In other words, we should know what we want to solve before coming up with solutions. Without this knowledge of what we want to produce, how can we explore the capabilities of our tools? In contrast, John Shabb proposed that we do not spend too much time thinking about additional reports at this time – focus on the mapping and these mandatory and needed reports first.	
	It was decided that we will prioritize report requests and/or by category. So report requests from the Dean would be a priority along with reports that are mandated by MedEd and LCME.	
	So far the list of reports that will be done are: • Medical School Questionnaire part 2 • DCI questions from EASRS	
	In addition, we need to be aware that mapping the curriculum is a multiple year project and the LCME visit is approaching fast, so we need to get started on this soon. The problem with this is that there is no one person in charge of guiding the process, and often only a few people end up doing it because they know it needs to get done.	
	Everyone is encouraged to read the standard 8.3 report, that Alissa Hancock will send to CEMS once MCC approves the last section of the report. This report has a lot of information regarding CEMS.	
	Next meeting: A brief report of what the subgroup has found in exploring eValue's capabilities, and other new developments from this area. Then, we will start our beginning steps in the objectives-writing and mapping process and assign tasks.	
	Future Tasks: 1. Determine what data can be extracted from E*Value, and what we need to get somewhere else. Confirm how and where we will get all data. (in progress)	

	2. Activities surrounding creation of a keyword list. (awaiting objectives process/implementation) 3. Addition of keywords and additional cleanup and organizational work in E*Value. (in process) 4. Try a sample report, to see how long it takes. 5. Discussion and/or related activities to course and session level objectives. 6. Discussion of the course level and session level objectives should be written at the same level or one higher than the other?	
8. Adjournment	Meeting was adjourned at 2:47 p.m.	*The next meeting is scheduled for September 24, 2018, at 2:00 pm in E493 Conference Room, Grand Forks.*